

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/612,511	07/02/2003	Artie J. Goldberg	UCON/204/US	3528	
2543 75	90 04/19/2006		EXAMINER		
ALIX YALE & RISTAS LLP 750 MAIN STREET			BUMGARNER, MELBA N		
SUITE 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
HARTFORD, (HARTFORD, CT 06103			3732	
			DATE MAILED: 04/19/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		ϵ
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/612,511	GOLDBERG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Melba Bumgarner	3732
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing - earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ja	anuary 2006	
•—	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		osecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	·	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-23 and 36-44</u> is/are pending in the	application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23 and 36-44</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc		
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority document		
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receiv	ed in this National Stage
application from the International Burea	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Pother: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 19-23 and 36-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marrocco, III et al. (6,087,467). Marrocco, III et al. disclose a thermoplastic rigid rod polymer of polyphenylenes with solubilizing side groups such as a polymer comprising arylene or heteroarylene moieties joined together by 1-4 covalent bonds between adjoining ring carbon atoms, wherein at least about 95% of the covalent bonds are substantially parallel to each other. It is noted that Marrocco, III et al. disclose the claimed structural limitations and the polymer of Marrocco, III et al. being identical to the polymer as claimed is inherently capable of use as claimed, i.e. an orthodontic component. The polymer is used in neat form or with reinforcing fibers and/or filler. The polymer has unreinforced tensile modulus of about 7 to 21 GPa. Marrocco, III et al. disclose a polymer appearing to be identical to the claimed invention; therefore the specific properties claimed would be inherently present in the polymer of Marrocco, III et al.
- 3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldberg et al. (4,717,341). Goldberg et al. disclose an orthodontic component comprising a rigid backbone polymer include a solubilizing side group (example 12). The component comprises reinforcing fibers, filler, or non-rigid backbone polymer (column 5 line 15, column 7 line 15). The

Application/Control Number: 10/612,511 Page 3

Art Unit: 3732

component comprises a wire having a shape capable of providing a good fit in a bracket (column 4 line 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 6 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrocco, III et al. in view of Goldberg. Marrocco, III et al. disclose the polymer that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the polymer in the form of a wire. Goldberg et al. teach a rigid backbone polymer in the form of wire having cross sectional shaped selected from a circle or polygon or a bracket having a slot configured for wires. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the polymer of Marrocco, III et al. modified in the form of Goldberg et al. in order to have orthodontic appliances providing uniformity in force and more controlled tooth movement in view of Goldberg.
- 6. Claims 8-14, 16, 17, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. Goldberg et al. disclose an orthodontic component that shows the limitations as described above and comprising a thermoplastic polymer; however, they do not disclose the polymer properties in its neat resin form. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the properties in the neat form as the component is not limited to being neat. The polymer would have elastic deformation at least as low as about

Application/Control Number: 10/612,511

Art Unit: 3732

30. Goldberg et al. do not show the refractive index range of the component; however, it would have been an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the refractive index in that Goldberg et al. teaches aesthetic components that are clear or tooth-colored. The component made of the polymer would have hardness of at least about 75 in Rockwell B scale. Goldberg et al. show final product having flexural modulus and flexural strength exceeding (almost double in some examples) of the claimed tensile modulus and tensile strength of the neat resin form; although the tensile modulus and tensile strength of Goldberg et al. may test to be lower than the flexural modulus and flexural strength, it is believed that the claimed limitations would be met, if they were of the final product. The reinforcing agent comprises 5 percent by weight of the component. The wire has cross sectional shaped selected from a circle or polygon. The component comprises a bracket having a slot configured for wires. The component comprises a matrix of polymeric materials. The reinforcing material may comprise the thermoplastic polymer.

Page 4

7. Claims 15 and 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. in view of Wool (5,174,753). Goldberg et al. disclose an orthodontic component that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the wire having cross section that is not circular and not quadrilateral. Wool teaches an orthodontic wire having such cross sections. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wire of Goldberg et al. to have the cross section as in Wool in order to increase the flexibility and ease the insertion of the wire fitting into various slotted brackets. Goldberg et al. disclose an orthodontic component that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the wire having different cross section at different

Application/Control Number: 10/612,511

Art Unit: 3732

points along its length. Wool teaches an orthodontic wire comprising different cross section at different points along its length. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the wire of Goldberg et al. to have the cross section as in Wool in order to have the wire when in use insure rearward translation and prevent tipping of the anterior brackets, and reduce friction and the tendency of the wire to bind with the posterior brackets in view of Wool.

Page 5

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed January 17, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the polymer or plastics having direct covalent bonding of one arylene group to another arylene group along the polymer back bone) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. The limitation of "rigid backbone polymer" is given its broadest meaning in that a polypropylene—based polymer or PMMA may be defined as having a rigid backbone in the art. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melba Bumgarner whose telephone number is 571-272-4709. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached at 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Melba Bumgarner

Helpa Bungainer

Primary Examiner